DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 863 95 SP 008 232

TITLE	Inside-Out: The Final Report and Recommendations of the Teachers National Field Task Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-OE-74-12002-FR
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	58p.; For related documents, see SP 008 231, 233, and 234
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Inservice Teacher Education; Preservice Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Teachers National Field Task Force

ABSTRACT

This report is one of six to be released by as many task forces on the improvement and reform of American education. After a brief introduction, the teaching task is defined and the major components of teaching are listed: (a) the determination of the individual student's program, (b) the design of experiences that help the student implement the program, and (c) the assessment of how well the experience meets the student's need. The next two sections are devoted to the topic of developing and maintaining professional competence. The report recommends that teacher centers be the focus of professional education above the preservice level. The next section of the report is devoted to a brief discussion of teachers' concerns which include (a) inner-city schools, (b) racism, (c) bilingual-bicultural education, (d) accountability, (e) class size, (f) teacher surplus, (g) early childhood education, (h) standardized tests, (i) the "four-day" teaching week, (j) performance-based teacher education, (k) the total community as a learning center, (l) performance contracting, (m) vouchers, (n) governance of the teaching profession, and (o) collective bargaining. (HMD)

ED 093863

DHEW Publication No. (OE) 74-12002

INSIDE-OUT:

The Final Report and Recommendations of the TEACHERS NATIONAL FIELD TASK FORCE on the IMPROVEMENT AND REFORM OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP008 232

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, *Secretary*
Charles B. Saunders, Jr., *Acting Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
John Ottina, *Commissioner*

In 1972 the U.S. Office of Education funded six independent National Field Task Forces on the Improvement and Reform of American Education. The names of these task forces are:

Administration and Supervision
Basic Studies
Community
Council of Chief State School Officers
Higher Education
Teachers

This publication presents the final report and recommendations of the Teachers task force. Reports and recommendations of the other task forces are published separately. These reports and recommendations do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.--No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

MEMBERS OF THE TEACHERS TASK FORCE

Marybeth Ardike
Wilson Junior High School
Cleveland, Ohio

J. Michael Crosby
Wilde Lake High School
Columbia, Maryland

Tommy Fulton
124 E. Northrup
Midwest City, Oklahoma

George G. Gumeson
Claremont College
Claremont, California

Mel Leasury, Co-Chairperson
Jefferson Elementary School
Ferndale, Michigan

Vera Modiste
3120 Brittan Avenue
San Carlos, California

Thelma Outler
2390 N.W. 48th Street
Miami, Florida

LEADERSHIP TRAINING
INSTITUTE ON TEACHER
PREPARATION REPRESENTATIVES

Kathy Adams
Donald Orlosky
B. Othanel Smith

Frank Perez
14 Flying Cloud Course
Corte Madera, California

Doris Ray
Lathrop High School
Fairbanks, Alaska

Marilyn Rauth
Research Division
American Federation of Teachers
Washington, D.C.

Leona Sibelman, Co-Chairperson
17542 Orna Drive
Granada Hills, California

Anita Tur
Weequahic High School
Newark, New Jersey

Gloria Weinman
Public School #176
Queens, New York City, New York

Lauri Wynn
2516 W. Brown Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
REPRESENTATIVES

Robert Ardike
Allen Schmieder

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1974

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1

FOREWORD

In its continuing effort to develop programs which are more responsive to local needs, the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems of the U.S. Office of Education (OE) established six field task forces in early 1972 to contribute directly to its intensified efforts to help improve the Nation's school systems and the preparation of the people who staff them. These new groups, appropriately called the Field Task Forces on Improvement and Reform in American Education, represented a major commitment by the OE to involve people, institutions, and organizations in a continuing appraisal of its existing national training programs and in the development of alternative program strategies.

The creation of the Field Task Forces was a significant step in OE's efforts to build more effective mechanisms for utilizing the best of the wisdom and experience of its funded training projects and persons on the educational firing line. This particular effort built strongly on the work of Task Force 72,[1] under the leadership of Dr. Allen Schmieder, which directly involved the contributions of over 10,000 educators in the development of its reports and recommendations.

The Field Task Forces brought together a national cross-section of pacesetters from the major constituencies of American education--teachers, State education departments, the community, school administration and supervision, higher education, and spokesmen for the basic subjects taught in the schools--for a 6-month analysis of the key concepts underlying current training program policies, and more importantly, to help develop more effective means for achieving systematic educational improvement and reform. It is hoped that this important intensive task force effort will provide some models for a more systematic and continuing dialogue between Washington, the Regions, and the American and international community regarding the formulation and implementation of national educational training policy.

The need for and desirability of such Windows to the Bureaucracy[2] is reflected in the enthusiastic response from the Nation to this call to

---

1 A task force organized in early 1971 by the former Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (later National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems and now the Division of Educational Systems Development, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education) to examine the implications of training complexes, protocol and training materials, the OE-commissioned Elementary Teacher Training Models, and competency-based teacher education for educational reform and for future programing affecting educational personnel.

2 The title of a publication of the National Advisory Council of Education Professions Development which calls for a much greater involvement of people in the field in the development of national education program policy.

action. The Task Forces, whose members were nominated by a wide range of education personnel and groups from OE-sponsored programs and projects, included representatives from organizations which collectively have several million members. All major geographic regions and almost all racial and ethnic groups were represented in a rich variety of personnel embracing such committed leaders as the White House Teacher of the Year, the President of the American Counseling and Guidance Association, the President of the National Council on Anthropology and Education, the Chairman of the National Conference on English Education, the head of the Black Caucus of the National Education Association, the Director of the Education Division of the National Conservation Foundation, the President of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Leadership Training Institute Directors, and the Director of the Schools Division of the National Science Foundation. In the Field Task Forces, too, were to be found classroom teachers, parents, community activists, administrators, and others without formal title who by their involvement in training projects displayed a heavy personal stake and a deep-seated commitment to change.

But all of the members, who formed vested interest group concerns, were selected in the hope that their recommendations would reflect their personal wisdom as well as the best of the training program viewpoints and policies of their groups.

The Task Forces had three major purposes: (1) to make recommendations regarding how best to use discretionary training funds for the improvement of the quality of American education, (2) to help develop specific training strategies for the improvement of educational systems through more effective development of educational personnel, and (3) to show the way to a more effective communication system between the national Federal offices, regional offices, State offices and their constituencies.

The Field Task Forces completed their respective studies in the Fall of 1973. Their reports and recommendations reflect their reactions to the state of improvement and reform in American education as it existed at that time. Many changes have occurred since then--as a result of steps taken by the Administration, by the Congress, and by the educational community. Although some of this material is therefore necessarily dated, so much of it is still current and useful that I feel that these reports will prove valuable not only today, but in the future. Although they do not necessarily reflect OE positions and policies, they contain the opinions of knowledgeable and dedicated men and women. With this in mind, I commend them to you most earnestly.

Washington, D.C.
May 1974

William L. Smith
Director, Teacher Corps
(formerly Associate Commissioner
of the National Center for the
Improvement of Educational Systems)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Foreword	iii
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Teaching Task	3
III.	Developing Professional Competence	9
IV.	Maintaining Professional Competence	15
V.	The Necessity for and the Nature of Change	19
VI.	Specific Items of Concern to Teachers	27
VII.	Conclusion	43
	Appendixes	
	A. Selected Items from Current Research	45
	B. Teacher Centers: Who's in Charge?	51

I. INTRODUCTION

Who are we?

We are teachers. Our skills, special training, and experience in the classroom give us a knowledge of schools not available to any other group. We know what is being done well; we know what is being done poorly or not at all; and we know what must be done to make schools better than they are.

What do we do?

We provide our students with empathetic understanding, an awareness of their personal values, success experiences that build their self-concepts and cognitive skills necessary to become productive members of society, and we all do it differently; we are as much individuals as are our students.

What are the results?

Excellent, when we consider the restrictions placed on us by limited resources, the constraints of the bureaucracy, the fact that we have little influence or authority in major educational decisions--but falling short when we acknowledge the variety of student needs unmet.

What must be done?

1. Teachers must have the authority and freedom to make instructional decisions appropriate to the needs of their students.

2. Decisionmaking bodies must be restructured so that schools become responsive to the needs of their clients.

3. Major changes in programs of teacher preparation and inservice training must be undertaken to staff schools with personnel prepared to teach in the present, anticipating the future, as contrasted with our present staff, primarily trained to teach in the past.

4. School programs and school facilities must be so designed that students, parents, and the community as a whole view the school as an integral part of their environment. The school must be seen as both the best use of time and resources in the present and a wise investment in the future.

5. Alternative methods of meeting the educational needs of students must be implemented so that each is able to utilize his or her own unique skills and interests in a program that will prepare each as a productive member of society.

6. Federal funds must be continuously available to public schools for the purpose of initiating and maintaining activities that bring about constructive change, a necessary and unmet need in this time of rapid societal change.

7. Society, under national, State, and local political leadership, must support responsible educational improvement issues and treat education as the priority item they say it is.

Who can do it?

Teachers in coalition with other groups interested in improving education.

What will result?

Students will participate in programs they recognize as valuable to them; programs designed to meet their needs; programs that acknowledge human diversity rather than superimpose conformity.

Parents will view schools as a place where their children can gain skills and experiences to help them utilize productively the resources available to them.

Teachers will be able to use their talents and training in response to the needs of students, rather than serving the needs of the system.

This report speaks of teaching and learning from the perspective of teachers; teachers who look out from inside today's schools to the communities they are expected to serve. We make no attempt to define school, for that definition will vary from community to community as parents, teachers, and students combine their values, talents, and resources to meet their educational needs.

Discrepancies between what is and what ought to be abound. To dwell upon these shortcomings is to view the schools as totally inadequate, a view unjustified in that more young people in the United States are in school than ever before, and they are staying in school longer and receiving a better education then ever before. Our effort is to describe from our perspective the minimum that must be done to make a fundamentally good system better.

II. THE TEACHING TASK

Teachers are facilitators of learning. They assist and direct the natural and inevitable learning processes of their students. In addition to assisting in acquiring competencies and values, teachers must create experiences that will enable students to think critically and analytically, make independent decisions, develop social consciousness, and recognize the importance of making productive contributions to the community.

The ability of the individual teacher to be a facilitator of learning is affected by the environment in which the students and teachers meet. In many cases, the present school environment needs significant change if the quality of education is to be improved.

The school, as an institution, has a tendency to ignore the fact that learning is a personal experience occurring continuously in all people. Evidence of this ignorance is shown in such school-propagated activities as establishing inappropriate groups, standardizing behavioral expectations, and evaluating what students do on some arbitrary scale ranging from failure to outstanding. Little note is taken of what the student really learns. The present school environment, with its orientation toward mass production, often inhibits the teacher's ability to meet individual student needs.

Learning is an active process in which the student must be the doer. Therefore, teaching, to be effective, must place emphasis on establishing situations in which the student is the producer. The teacher's actions must not intrude upon the student's opportunities to do--hence, learn. The teacher's contributions in assistance and direction are essential if the student is to realize fully his or her own potential for growth.

The major components of good teaching are cyclic in nature. They are: (1) the determination of the individual student's program needs; (2) the design of experiences that help the student implement the program; and (3) the assessment of how well the experience meets the student's need. The latter is synonymous with the determination of further needs. To demonstrate the cycle, a closer examination of these three components is in order:

1. The proper determination of the individual student's program is the joint responsibility of the teacher, the student, and his parents. The gradual assumption of personal responsibility for instructional program planning is an experience denied most students today. This determination of individual student program takes into account past achievements, community and family expectations, actions of peers, and the student's perception of his long- and short-range goals. It is in this activity that the student recognizes his worth and sees in his teacher a respect for the values upon which his decisions are based. This is a painstaking process and one for which the teacher

needs both training and experience. At the present time, many teachers substitute their own values or the school's values for those of the parent and student, thus dictating rather than directing. This not only damages the self-esteem of the maturing student, but prevents the student from making decisions, a skill he needs to develop but one he is generally forbidden to practice.

2. The schools most often design experiences for groups of students within a limited environment. Lack of staff and an abundance of students have led to this common practice. Whether the experience fits an individual need, the degree to which individual students benefit from the experience, and whether the experience can be implemented by all students in a group are questions seldom asked. To be effective, a designed experience must be based on a determined need and it must be within the student's capability. The teacher is responsible for seeing that any experience design accounts for the full range of learning skills, i.e., the affective, the psychomotor, as well as the cognitive domains. Further, the activities within this experience should be identified by the student as appropriate to both immediate and long-range goals. In designing experiences, teachers must be able to use the total community as the learning environment. Restricting learning activities to the confines of a campus or the structured hours of a school day is to ignore the effect that the total environment inevitably has on any learning activity. These personalized experiences should consist of both activities undertaken individually and activities within a group when the group presence contributes to a successful experience.

3. The teacher and student must be continuously aware of the progress made in the implementation of any designed experience. Where the student succeeds, the teacher notes it, giving the student positive reinforcement in his perception of his abilities and compiling a record to inform parents of the student's progress. If implementation of the designed experience is perceived by the teacher or student to be failing in meeting the student's need, then either one can intervene to modify the learning experience. This on-going evaluation is the primary resource for further determination of student needs, thus completing the cyclic nature of these components.

In order to effectively implement this cycle of teaching activities, any educational program must consider teachers and students as unique individuals with varying skills and personalities. To relate students with only a single adult is a disservice to them and to the adult who is expected to be an effective teacher. Further, a single teacher cannot realistically determine immediate program needs, design experiences, and evaluate the effects of the designed experiences for the number of students constituting a class today.

The learning community (class) must have sufficient numbers of both adults and youths to develop a wide variety of communication patterns. Present inadequate staffing ratios and the trend toward further staff reductions

are creating a myth of a teacher surplus. Until the learning needs of individual students are met, there should be no arbitrary limit to the number of qualified people added to the school system. Teachers should be as freely available to one another as they are to their students; a condition impossible to achieve in most of today's schools.

When the proper environment for teaching is established, teachers become partners in learning with students and colleagues sharing experiences and planning together to realize both the goals of the individual student and the school. Traditionally, the concept of in loco parentis has influenced the role of the classroom teacher. Schools perpetuate a paternalistic model of control and decisionmaking. All too frequently, the myth that "daddy knows best" characterizes administrator interaction with teachers and teacher treatment of students. This climate of excessive authority, repression, and disregard for individuality increases frustrations, results in negative learning, and physical or psychological dropping out. The teaching environment must be one of freedom and mutual respect to encourage students to develop responsibility.

It is a reasonable expectation that proper development of an educational program in a school will require some differentiation of tasks. In most cases this will be necessary if the individual talents of the professional staff are to be fully utilized. Differentiated roles and responsibilities should be established on a horizontal basis with salaries for fully certified personnel based on relevant out-of-school experience, years in service, and continuing education. This does not rule out the use of positive elements such as flexible staff assignment, individualized inservice programs, cooperative team approaches, interdisciplinary curriculum, or cross-age grouping. This concept of horizontal differentiation is consistent with the principle of extra-pay-for-extra-work. It avoids the inflexibility of levels common to most plans of vertical differentiation. Attempts to institutionalize, rigidize, or bureaucratize patterns of staff utilization should be rejected. The extra-pay-for-extra-work principle bases extra salaries upon the performance of additional tasks as determined and assigned by teachers--supervision of interns, committee work, program planning and coordination--not upon designated, locked-in "levels" of responsibility. Since the nature of these tasks will vary, as dynamic programs must vary, rigid ladders of any kind are rejected.

Effective school management, the key to maintaining a proper learning environment, involves two components: (1) clerical accounting responsibilities, largely bureaucratic in nature, and (2) program responsibilities through which the educational needs of the students are met. Clerical-type administrative duties should be delegated to a trained business manager whose sole function is to relate the available resources to the educational program. The management of the educational program should be the responsibility of those trained and experienced in education--the teachers. A school's principal clearly would be the "principal-teacher." The advantage of this system is that the program administrator as a teacher, can communicate with and offer help to teachers in a

nonthreatening, nonpunitive way. With administrative clerical duties left to the business manager-administrator, the program administrator (principal-teacher) is free to devote time exclusively to teaching-learning concerns. Budgetary decisions in such a system of dual administration are made cooperatively by both business managers and teachers.

Teachers' activities cannot be restricted to the school environment if teachers are to be effective facilitators of student learning. Teachers must have a first-hand knowledge of the students' total environment. To this end, effective communication between parents and teachers is necessary; it must be two-way communication on a one-to-one basis. The present system of periodic grading, even though many systems have a built in feedback mechanism, is a barrier to effective communication because it categorizes and institutionalizes what should be common personal concerns. Parents and teachers should meet and talk whenever there is a need. Either party should be free to initiate the contact, although realistically the first step will usually rest with teachers.

Much of this parent-teacher dialogue should include the students. This is particularly true as they become more mature and are expected to assume more responsibility for their own activities. If students are not included, they may view the home and the school--both authoritarian environments--as either in conflict over who has ultimate control or as conspiring to effect control. Neither outcome is consistent with expectations for student development of a sense of personal responsibility.

Teachers, however, must have time available to make parent contacts on a regular basis. To achieve this, teachers should be assigned reasonable student loads and given some flexibility in scheduling. To meet regularly with parents, teachers need to be knowledgeable about the communities in which they teach. This means that a component of teaching in any community will be a training program through which teachers gain knowledge of the community. The components of such training should have a community, not a school, origin.

The community is a resource frequently ignored in most educational programs. In children's early years, from birth to age 5 or 6, the total learning experience is in the community, primarily at home, although in some cases children may have some type of early childhood education experience, i.e., parent co-op, nursery school, or Head Start. It is well documented that these are the years of greatest learning achievement. Oral language, values, psychomotor skills, and reasoning are all established during these preschool years. In fact, educational programs are designed on the basis that children have these skills before entering school.

After entering the regular public school program, students still spend only one-seventh of their time in this environment. School-initiated programs should be so designed that the total community experience of each student is an integral part of schooling. The technology and resources for such programs are available. The changes needed are in the utilization of

these existing resources. Designed learning experiences must include activities that utilize other community facilities than merely the school if the student is to realize the difference between schooling and education. Teachers must have the authority and freedom to design educational experiences using the best resources, whether or not they are present within the confines of the campus. This requires a radical change in our methods of pupil accounting but such change is necessary, for current pupil accounting methods are more compatible with custodial care than with intellectual growth.

III. DEVELOPING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

Developing professional competence has two aspects of equal importance. They are:

1. Learning to teach. This is a personal experience accomplished by teaching. There is no other way to learn to teach.

2. Learning about teaching. This is a vicarious experience which consists of watching, analyzing, and philosophizing about teaching.

Adequate teacher preparation includes both of these elements in a continuing dynamic inter-relationship. Preparation for teaching begins the instant an individual begins to learn. Learners utilize all those who surround them as teachers; anyone who influences another acts the role of teacher. Thus, any person is a potential member of the teaching profession. Selection should not be geared to any particular segment of society, as was true in the past when teachers were predominantly middle-class--the poor were excluded due to the costs of professional preparation and the affluent excluded themselves because of the teaching profession's lack of status.

The logical process of transfer from preparation to teaching is internship, a process not adequately covered by the present program of student teaching. The internship should be a time for a newly prepared teacher to assume teaching responsibilities but not to assume them totally or in isolation. A new teacher frequently faces serious problems, usually related to classroom management. Under present conditions, there is no adequate provision for assistance in these problems. By going to the principal, a seemingly logical source of help, the new teacher risks the danger of appearing inept and incurring unsatisfactory first-year evaluations. If he approaches other teachers for help, he may not receive it. Furthermore, he may postpone the request until the problem is well established and correction much more difficult. Advice received informally from other teachers, while invaluable, is usually remedial in nature rather than preventive and usually comes much too late. The alternative to seeking help from the principal or fellow teachers is to just survive. Unfortunately, many new teachers choose this final alternative and endure a year of frustration while their students suffer a year of educational mediocrity.

The intern assumes all the responsibilities for assisting and directing students' learning activities but with a limited teaching load. Teaching tasks have first priority but with a smaller load there can be adequate time to perform tasks that will require much less time after the intern is experienced. This provides time to do a good job and prevents the shortchanging of students. In addition, the intern is expected to communicate regularly with other staff in regard to day-by-day experiences, be they instructional, organizational, or professional. This planned communication is an integral part of the teacher-intern relationship, not an

occasional response to incidental problems. The experienced teacher has a single function in regard to the intern--to assist and direct--and must be given time commensurate with the task. This relationship in no way involves either supervision or evaluation. These responsibilities remain, as they always have, with management personnel.

The provision for internship is the joint responsibility of the hiring district and the local teachers' organization. Such matters as appropriate teaching load, numbers of interns accommodated, satisfactory wage and fringe benefits, method of intern assignment, etc., are proper items for inclusion in the master contract.

Responsibility for teacher preparation lies with the schools that need professional teachers, the community that depends upon the schools to meet educational needs, the institutions of higher education that provide training experiences for teacher development, the professional teachers' organizations that promote understanding of training needs and expected performance standards, and primarily, with the individual who aspires to become a teacher. A program of teacher preparation that ignores one or more of these factors is inadequate.

Improved programs of teacher preparation require much closer cooperation between public school districts, institutions of higher learning and the organized teaching profession. The presence of teachers-in-training in public schools should be much greater. Their activities might vary from class participation as a student, sitting with teachers in planning and evaluation sessions, talking with parents, assisting in the instruction of individual students, to participation in training programs designed to meet unique local needs. Interns will become aware, through first hand experience, of the professional concerns of teachers; concerns related to teachers' working conditions and the benefits of being members of the teaching profession.

Appropriate coalitions must be established to provide inschool experience so that the prospective teacher has experiences in a number of schools, environments, elementary and secondary education, and a variety of school communities--inner-city, suburban, and rural. In addition to the school district, higher education and teachers' organizations, various community groups must participate in such coalitions. This will allow the prospective teacher to see the variations present in schools and to make judgments concerning special preparation for a particular phase of public education. It is unrealistic to support a general education program that purports to train teachers and at the same time isolates them from the school environment where they will be expected to perform with competence.

The condescending attitude of many teacher education professors toward elementary and secondary teachers, combined with their traditional control of both preservice and inservice teacher preparation, is not conducive to realistic change in teacher preparation. This singularity of decision-making has been a major force in preserving the status quo, thus generating

much of the concern for today's inadequate educational programs. Teachers, through recognized teacher organizations, must participate with State departments of education and higher education to make decisions based on real needs. Until such coalitions are made, teacher organizations will continue to confront current decision making bodies. Unless higher education recognizes teacher concerns about standards and teacher power as forces of change in teacher preparation, school districts or professional organizations will appropriate the teacher preparation functions. Higher education, as the only decisionmaker, will be left out. Current activities leading toward performance based teacher certification evidence this trend, and it is seriously proposed in some areas that licensure become a task of local superintendents.

The classroom teacher should be central to the planning and implementation of any program of teacher preparation. No individual knows better than the teacher what the task of teaching entails. Present teacher preparation programs, which to a large degree are designed and implemented by colleges and universities, are confined to teaching about teaching. They miss the mark when it comes to teaching to teach.

Higher education is a fact of life for those preparing to teach. It is not likely to change. The name "higher education" is an unfortunate misnomer and falsely gives exclusive prestige to what should be considered an integral part of a total educational program.

Higher education provides an environment, resources, and a formal record of the experiences of students following programs of teacher preparation; it is a service agency to the teaching profession. In order to provide the services most needed, institutions of higher education must have the knowledge of what is necessary to prepare competent teachers, information that is best obtained from teachers practicing in classrooms. Aspiring teachers have the right to expect three things from their higher education experiences: (1) competency in specific subject areas; (2) competency in a variety of teaching methods, methods appropriate to varying student needs and populations; and (3) an understanding of the role of the schools.

Further, higher education must include these ingredients in a simultaneous parallel manner--not on an alternating or sequential basis. Human resources are wasted by spending 3 or 4 years in an academic environment to gain subject competence; add 1 or 2 more years for development of educational philosophy, based on theoretical material, and a semester or two of student teaching (where decisions are made by a supervisor while the student tries to relate theory, practice, and subject matter). The neophyte, but certified, teacher is then placed in isolation with a group of students to either sink or swim. Not only is this practice wasteful, it is grossly unfair to the new teacher and to the students he is expected to serve.

Finally, colleges must assume the responsibility of preparing teachers to teach in a world of change. Prospective teachers must know what

educational research is doing, what is known, and what is not known about the teaching-learning process. They must understand the nature of the knowledge explosion and its implications for curriculum and curriculum change. They must be aware of human relationships and how those relationships change with the social and economic structures of society. To meet these expectations, higher education must support teacher preparation to at least the same financial level invested in the preparation of doctors of medicine. The mental health of our society is as important as is the physical welfare of the individual.

An adequate program of teacher preparation involves not only school districts and institutions of higher education but professional organizations as well. Professional organizations are the means by which teachers speak and act in the interest of education. This independent forum voices the concerns of all teachers and identifies common needs. The implementation of a teacher's creativity is limited by the current unavailability of resources and the common practices of the employer. No such constraints exist as a teacher participates in professional organizations. The independence and autonomy of such organizations provide the most effective vehicle for identifying changes that lead toward professional improvement.

The role of professional organizations does not end in the identification of needed changes. A further task is to disseminate an understanding of the needs in three major directions. These are:

1. To the local district. This is best done by establishing, through a contract, communication mechanisms that ensure the function of mutually agreed upon responsibilities for bringing about change.

2. To institutions of higher education. When the needed changes involve the cooperation of such institutions with both the needs and the criteria by which the achievement of those needs can be documented.

3. To the community at large. Who else but the organizations representing education can assume an advocacy role for a better program of teacher preparation?

Closely related to the preparation of teachers is governance of the profession, which is the determination of who shall be certified to teach in public schools, the establishment of criteria for such certification, and the assurance of continuing competency of those certificated.

When a school program or individual teacher is determined to be ineffective, there is a cry for teachers to get their house in order. However, it is not the teachers' house, although it should be. Teachers do not determine who enters it, what tasks are to be performed in it, nor do they have the opportunity to change deficient performance. The complete lack of teacher self-governance has led to the establishment of tenure, a condition necessary for personal and financial security--security so that the individual

teacher can concentrate on the teaching task. Teacher organizations are in favor of tenure for it is in the best interest of teachers and education, until due process through self-governance is attained.

Long years of education, continual training after entering the teaching ranks, and the responsibility for the education of our most precious resource--our children--identify teachers as professionals; yet they find themselves in an incongruous position. Doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers--all other professionals govern their own professions. In contrast, teachers do not have a deciding voice in their own destinies. Control over all aspects of the educational profession is relegated to lay school boards, local politicians, State legislatures, etc. Teachers, through legislation, must have a role in determining the meaning and measurability of competence; then, and only then, can they be responsible for the individual effectiveness of themselves and their colleagues. When this takes place it will no longer be possible for colleges, in collusion with school districts and State departments of education, to force teachers and prospective teachers to enroll in irrelevant and outdated courses and institutes. Teachers have the knowledge of course content and experiences needed for adequate preparation. Self-governance provides the authority to act upon that knowledge.

IV. MAINTAINING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

Most teachers who are teaching today will still be teaching ten years from now. What will they be teaching and how will they be teaching it? Staffing a school with well prepared and competent teachers is no guarantee that staff competency will continue. There are too many variables at work. Attending student populations change character as the surrounding neighborhood changes; rural schools become suburban, suburban schools grow at unprecedented rates; and inner-city schools face totally revised programs to accommodate changing economic and social conditions. A school serving the needs of a specific community must be responsive to community needs; changing as the community changes. In addition to these responsive changes, the school must initiate change internally as appropriate curricular materials are adopted, as methodology is modified to meet student need, and as internal organizational changes indicate different staff responsibilities.

Maintaining competence will involve the individual teacher, the teaching staff as an entity, the school district, professional organizations, those community agencies that depend on the schools to provide citizens with skills and attitudes needed by a productive community, and those that have resources for use in the training of staff and the development of relevant programs.

The school district and the teachers' professional organizations share the responsibility for maintaining an effective staff. Let us speak plainly to this point; it is crucial to the improvement of our public schools. It concerns both the autonomy of school district governing boards and their relationship to the professional staff. It is well known that schools are slow to respond to unique student needs or to initiate change. However, this is not at all unexpected considering the management structure of schools. The groups now responsible for acting as change agents are school boards, consisting of elected or selected lay representatives, and the school administrators. Neither group participates in the prime function of the school--teaching and learning. The school board is not composed of professional educators and, therefore, should not be expected to make decisions in the professional arena. Its task is to oversee the entire school program by describing what the community expects from the schools and determining whether or not the community is satisfied with what it receives. Theoretically, educational decisions are the responsibility of professional educators and should result in a program satisfactory to the board and the community's representatives. This division of responsibility, however, does not always work in practice. In most school districts, the larger ones in particular, survival ranks highest on the list of needs of governing boards and school managers. The task of accommodating legislative and budget restrictions is so complex that there is little time, personnel, or desire to magnify these problems by contemplating change--change based on educational needs, not economic considerations. Simple maintenance of the status quo exhausts the resources available. The

challenge is to meet the needs of children in a changing society, not the needs of an existing bureaucratic system.

If schools are to increase their effectiveness, teachers and administrators must work as an integral part of the governing body in identifying needed educational changes and implementing programs to accomplish them. Teachers are in the best position to determine what works and what doesn't in reaching educational goals and meeting student needs. Further, each teacher has this information for his unique teaching situation. Administrative data that reflect district-wide conditions can be totally unrepresentative of any particular situation. The maintenance and improvement of the instructional program, although a cooperative activity, must be dependent on the teachers' knowledge of needs. Sadly, many school board members and administrators perceive the teacher as an indentured servant, rather than a professional with knowledge and skills. Such administrators and board members see themselves as system managers rather than as facilitators of education.

The teaching staff must have the responsibility for determining what needs are not being met and what training and materials are needed to develop effectiveness. The district has the responsibility of supplying the resources to maintain the most effective program. To assign responsibility where it can be carried out effectively and to maintain a responsive system staffed with competent teachers, a new unit is proposed for all public schools--the teachers' center. (See Appendix B.)

The function of a teachers' center is to maintain an effective educational program through continual teacher preparation in the knowledge, attitudes, and techniques of teaching. The teachers' center will provide opportunities for teachers to participate in a continuing effort to maintain and upgrade skills. Continual education and training are an obligation upon both the teaching profession and the school district, and it could serve as the pivotal component of an educational planning system.

The program within the teachers' center is a continuous process, cyclic in nature, the first step being to determine the needs of students and teachers. This assessment is both responsive (identifying current deficiencies) and creative (initiating new procedures and developing new materials). This needs identification is the basis for determining specific program goals. These goals are interpreted by teachers into specific program objectives. This allows teachers to design specific activities by which they demonstrate competence in the understanding and accomplishment of the objectives in their unique teaching situations. The final component of the cycle is evaluating the degree to which the objectives are attained and observing the effect of their attainment on reaching the predetermined goals. This final step, in practice, is synonymous with the initial step of needs assessment and completes the cycle. The teacher's role and responsibility in the teacher center is the same as it is with students, but the focus is on assisting and directing the learning of teachers rather than students.

The establishment of teachers' centers is seen by the Task Force as a positive solution to some of the current problems associated with achieving educational accountability.

The elements of a teachers' center program must be determined by those teachers whom the center serves. Such elements include, but are not limited to:

1. Better techniques and procedures for dealing with individual student problems in basic communication skills, particularly reading, oral, and writing skills. This involves identifying, developing, and using diagnostic materials and techniques. Appropriate programs and materials must be designed so that the student effectively uses the resources available to him.

2. Developing activities through which students can discover how to wisely and creatively use their freedom for self-fulfillment and social improvement.

In addition to activities related to student-teacher relationships, the center serves as a base for cooperative endeavors between teachers and those involved in educational research. Such program elements could lead to:

1. Dealing in a positive way with the multicultural aspects of a class as well as of the community at large. This aspect of a teachers' center program requires special attention where the learning-teaching process is affected by bilingual conditions.

2. Race relations programs in which understanding, not accommodation, is the goal.

3. Developing group practice techniques. This is a clinical approach to the development of teaching patterns that fully utilize the unique talents found in groups of teachers and permits a student to have interaction with more than one teacher.

4. Keeping an up-to-date record of what is working in the educational programs of other school districts and providing a means of determining the appropriateness of their adoption.

The teachers' center should be governed by the teachers through their professional organization.

The program of a teachers' center must be under the control of teachers, who are the designers and immediate recipients of the teachers' center activities. To this end, the teachers, through their professional organizations, have the responsibility for participating in the governance of the center. This includes regulating mechanisms for obtaining the

educational concerns of all those affected by the school program--parents, students, teacher aides, management personnel, representatives of community groups, etc.

Placing program determination in the control of teachers is essential if the center is to respond to teacher-discerned needs. If program control is maintained within existing governance bodies, it is realistic to expect that system concerns will take precedence over identified educational needs--as is true in most district-controlled inservice programs.

The teachers' center's primary funding should be public sources--local, State, and Federal. Local funds currently used for inservice activities are appropriate; a portion of State funds used in research and similar programs could be allocated for teachers' centers, but the primary source should be Federal. This consists of a specific grant to each State to be distributed to districts establishing teachers' centers. Teachers' centers could also seek funding from other public and private agencies where locally determined programs make the use of such funds appropriate.

The obligation of each of these participating agencies--the school district and the professional organization--should be agreed to and formalized in the master contract that defines working conditions and specific responsibilities for the profession and the local district.

V. THE NECESSITY FOR AND THE NATURE OF CHANGE

The Task Force is clear on the need for change. The changes proposed will enable schools to accomplish two things not now being done, or being done poorly at best. One, the schools will be able to design and implement programs to meet the changing needs of individual students by placing curricular decisionmaking authority and responsibility in the hands of teachers. Two, public schools will be able to answer the demands of the public for accountability by defining who is accountable for what. Student accountability, teacher accountability, and management accountability will be recognized as separate functions with each held accountable for the results of its own decisions.

Rapid changes in our society are not reflected in most educational programs. Formerly, criticizing the schools was an academic exercise. Now it is a profitable pursuit, as demonstrated by the popularity of books and publications that acknowledge that schools could be better than they are. A result of this collective criticism has been a resurgence of conservative positions regarding public education. Seeing no clear way to go in the future and the common recognition of the need for change have led public opinion to look to the past for solutions, forgetting that the inadequacies of the past created the broader programs of today. In contrast to change efforts of the past the changes proposed in this report will provide new directions for public education, an education tailored toward the needs of individual students and recognizing that each is unique. Our national strength is weakened by failing to utilize the potential human wealth in this diversity.

In our American system, perhaps the best test of our priorities is examining where we put our money. It is the opinion of this Task Force that if needed changes are to occur, the funds to implement the changes must not be taken from presently functioning educational programs. Additional funds must be made available to initiate and maintain activities that bring about change. As separately funded change activities are proven effective, the use of currently appropriated funds may be modified, but in no case should one effort be stopped before an alternative is begun. Funds earmarked for improved programs must not be a cover for fund redistribution.

Change Coalitions

The responsibility for massive improvements in public education is necessarily and realistically a shared responsibility. The banding together of groups for the purpose of informing, influencing, and pressuring others is a proven method of bringing about change. The need for such coalitions is obvious in the face of inadequate funding of public education, poor facilities, inflexible school policies, and unresponsive legislatures. Teachers recognize the potential of such coalitions and know they must be entered into with respect and commitment of all participants.

Community involvement is overdue. It is necessary if effective changes in educational programs are to be realized. The responsibility for educating the youth of the community, while assigned to the schools, cannot be done without members of concerned community groups participating in appropriate phases of educational program design. Such participation will facilitate:

1. Effective utilization of community resources.

2. Community understanding of program objectives, procedures, and accomplishments.

3. The sharing of program responsibilities among relevant community client, service, and support groups.

School Boards and Change

Change, to be effective, cannot be considered the unilateral responsibility of local school governing bodies. Such boards, as now exist, are not and cannot be representative of the population they are expected to serve. Such boards, be they appointive or elective, generally consist of upper-middle-class citizens and are representative of only a small portion of the population. Their decisions represent their values, an inevitable result if they operate with integrity. The resulting school programs are thus naturally designed around a singular set of values. The implementation of such programs is the responsibility of the school administration, again a group of the upper-middle-class, which reinforces the singularity of school programs.

Change is a reality which all members of the educational enterprise must confront and to which they must respond. For too long public schools have sought to maintain the status quo. School board members, administrators, teachers, students, and community representatives have contributed to this reactionary situation. In order for schools to initiate an educational renaissance, an attitude of change as a function of the school must be inculcated in all parts of the system and primarily in policymaking groups. It is here that initial steps toward change must be taken. The Task Force believes that a typical school board cannot be representative of the community it serves. Therefore, rather than being a facilitator of change, it has an inhibiting effect. Further, research is urgently needed to examine new models of the school board's role, its responsibilities, and functions. Policymaking boards should be reconstructed to make them representative of and responsive to all constituencies.

Design for Consensus

In order to make effective decisions, there must be a means to reach consensus among those needing, designing, supporting, and implementing educational programs. Within such a diverse group, the problem of decision-making becomes paramount. Teachers are understandably apprehensive when

they consider their role as participants in a decisionmaking process where the final authority is vested in a single group. All too often such experience has been "tokenism," and teachers are expected to either provide support for a predetermined position or to appear as a party to a decision that really is contrary to their position. This apprehension is shared by other groups who are invited to participate in decisionmaking only to experience the same nonparticipatory involvement. A new direction is needed for such decisionmaking bodies. The collective opinions of diverse groups acting as equal partners in decisionmaking is a requirement of planning and implementing any program of educational change. The decisionmaking process adopted by the group must be based on the fact that each party has an undisputable concern to be satisfied and an indispensable contribution to be made. The result of the decisionmaking process must be a plan that each partner can actively support.

All societal structures change. The question now before us is how can we control the change to realize the continuing greater benefit to all concerned? The choices seem to be drift, decision, or destruction. Drift has been the normal process; we are now facing change by destruction in our schools.

The third alternative for change is decision. The Teacher Task Force proposes a means by which such decisions can be made, tried where they are needed, and assessed to determine their worth. These proposals create an environment within the public schools that make change a part of the normal operation of the school. But they eliminate the possibility of maintaining any change that does not prove to be effective. The major provision of these proposals is a decisionmaking mechanism that recognizes the values of all concerned.

The Federal Government and Educational Change

Education, though identified as a State responsibility, is also a Federal responsibility. Extensive national communication systems have made insularity of thought outdated. Ease of transportation and population mobility have greatly increased the numbers of students and teachers crossing lines, emphasizing the national concern for public education. To expect total responsibility for education to lie within individual States dependent on their own resources is to ignore the needs of our nationally-oriented, highly mobile population. This is an arena in which education must come up to date. It is a national responsibility to keep educational programs responsive to current needs.

It is appropriate that the Federal Government provide funds on a continuing basis for needed reform. The shifting of the responsibility for educational decisionmaking to teachers, the establishment of teachers' centers, and the implementation of teacher internships are all process activities and have equal implications in all states; hence a Federal responsibility. The maintenance of effective educational programs based

on the substantive needs of pupils remains the obligation of the States. We recommend that no less than one-third of any school district's budget be directed toward activities of continual program evaluation, needs assessment, and program design, and that these funds be provided by the Federal Government. Schools have not carried on these activities because State and local tax bases are not sufficient to supply funds for both maintenance and change programs.

The establishment of the National Institute of Education (NIE) may be a step in the right direction. However, unless the framework of NIE contains an appropriately funded mechanism for the direct study and application of the products of this institute, this Federal effort will fail to reach the local school level; it will fail to meet the needs of children. We emphasize that this funding be categorical for change programs and regular support, not block grants for restricted periods. Seed money provided to initiate program changes is usually wasted when sown in sterile ground, and certainly the present tax basis of most school districts is sterile ground. There are three specific reasons why reform programs should receive continual funding and be considered as a regular component of a school district budget. (1) The needs of students constantly change to reflect the changes in society in general and economic and social changes in school populations. (2) School personnel, teachers, and particularly auxiliary personnel are transient, and a singular effort to train staff for unique needs will not have a continuing effect. (3) Planning and preparation of school budgets is more efficient when the availability of resources is constant. The implementation of program changes like these proposed by the Teacher Task Force imply that there will be a reassignment of responsibility, modifications in personnel assignment, and training for staff to properly fulfill their tasks. For optimum effectiveness these are not 1-, 2-, or 3-year tasks; they describe a continuing and on-going component of the public school system.

Although the Task Force advocates greater Federal support of public education, in no way do we mean that this increased support imply greater Federal control of education. Specific limitations should be placed on distribution of Federal funds. These are:

1. Funds should supplement, not supplant, funds presently available to school districts.

2. Funding should occur only after the local district has demonstrated a willingness to participate. Limited funds may be used in the preparation of plans for obtaining full and continuing Federal funds.

3. Populations to be served should be workably small so that the natural resistance to change present in large political and economic systems is minimal.

4. Populations should initially be those in greatest need as identified by client dissatisfaction, demonstrated by inept performance or outright rejection of program opportunities.

5. The focus of change should be on the needs of children. Whether or not the institution serving those needs is "public" or "private" is a moot question.

6. Funds should be distributed to a variety of problem areas represented in urban, rural, and suburban areas.

7. There should be agreement by the local education agency to commit and redirect funds over which the LEA has control to support the proposed program changes.

8. There should be agreement between the administration and faculty which is demonstrated by written endorsement of the proposed program by the bargaining agent for the teaching faculty. The term "bargaining agent" means the major teacher organization in the district.

9. Activities should be federally funded only in those locations where teachers work under conditions defined in a master contract.

The last two criteria (8 and 9) are considered most important to the concept of real change. Effective programs call for significant change in the function of both teacher and administrator. If these groups are to be given an environment for change and creativity, such agreements will be necessary to provide for personal security, opportunity for appropriate program development, and training, as well as full implementation of programs substantially different from those familiar to governing boards and the community.

Educational Research

Change programs, be they supported by local, State, or Federal funds, or any combination of these funds, should be based on a comprehensive understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of current programs. Such information is gained through research. However, at the present time, less than 1 percent of the current educational budget is allocated for research. What valid research there is, which is relevant to the improvement of education for children, is insufficiently disseminated and/or improperly interpreted. The impact of educational research on the classroom is, therefore, so limited as to be nearly nonexistent.

A high priority must be placed on the establishment and funding of programs which will provide expanded opportunities for teachers to participate in research and development to improve the learning environment. This participation should begin with the very conception of research design and continue through terminal evaluations. Obviously such research needs to be school-based.

Relevant research will recognize that learning is neither an efficient nor an economical process. However, present research emphases on management and efficiency have regretfully reinforced the economic factor as the dominant variable in school program planning.

It is essential to establish a "modus operandi" for communication and cooperation between teachers and researchers. NIE must serve as a viable vehicle for the accomplishment of this purpose. However, NIE has failed so far to recognize the import and validity of this need. It is hoped that a desire to add relevance and realism to research will cause the National Institute of Education to eschew insularity and will encourage it to enter into the real world of public education by funding and conducting school-based studies with the professional teachers.

The James Report, a treatise on education and training of teachers in England, addresses the need for teachers and educational researchers to enter into cooperative efforts. Three of its recommendations are equally applicable in the United States:

1. Teachers--should have full opportunities to take part in curriculum development projects and other projects and investigations.

2. Research workers--coming into the school to pursue their studies should cooperate fully with teachers.

3. Teachers--wishing to take part in this kind of activity should have inservice opportunities to familiarize themselves with research techniques.

It must also be recognized that, due to the nature of the pheonomena, teaching and learning often need to be examined in light of empirical data. Education cannot hinge the definition of relevance in research on the scientific-industrial model of research techniques. Too many areas where educational research must be done involve the affective realm and concern process, not product-oriented hypotheses--areas which cannot be defined within the neatly prescribed range of one or several standard deviations.

In order to remedy this situation a much improved process must be established to deliver the results and implications of research to teachers. This not only implies that an adequate dissemination mechanism must be created, but also that the data must be reported with emphasis on implications for the teaching-learning process. Accompanying this research report should be suggestions as to how to convert such findings into appropriate methodologies so that the research will have impact upon classroom activities. Such recommendations and suggestions must be made by practicing teachers.

It is suggested that one means of achieving this information dissemination and retrieval service would be for the professional teacher organizations, in conjunction with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

and like organizations, to send out a monthly newsletter dedicated to this kind of exposure. However, to have such a newsletter reach every teacher monthly is but a bare and meager beginning. With the continuing expansion and development of media-oriented instructional materials and tools, much faster and more interest-stimulating models for research dissemination to teachers can be devised. But before this can happen, the educational community must recognize the need for teachers and research to merge efforts.

Such a partnership as has been described between research and teachers will create a vital intersection between the actual functioning of teachers and students and the valid findings of current research--thereby improving the classroom experience.

VI. SPECIFIC ITEMS OF CONCERN TO TEACHERS

The teaching task, preparation to teach, maintaining competency, and participating in change are professional concerns applicable to all teachers regardless of specific teaching assignment or geographical locale. Many other issues of a more specific nature are also of vital concern to teachers. While it is impossible to address each concern of over two million teachers, the Task Force feels that certain problems in public education must be considered. Although they are most pressing in limited areas, these problems have implications for the effectiveness of public education throughout the land.

There has been no attempt to prioritize these problems. The priority of each varies with the unique educational needs of differing communities, the diverse economic and societal backgrounds of students, and the varying educational systems. Though the problems appear in this chapter as separate issues, the Task Force recognizes their interrelationships.

Inner-City Schools

Many urban schools perpetuate the cycle of poverty, despair, and frustration. They consciously or inadvertently continue to discriminate against the poor and powerless. Many concerned Americans, educators and noneducators alike, have taken steps to improve the schools, to eradicate the inadequacies, and to develop programs which will afford the citizens of urban America the same opportunities that other Americans have. The efforts of those who have been trying are commendable, yet the situation remains critical. It is the responsibility of all those concerned with the future of this nation to accelerate efforts to improve inner-city schools.

The urban school crisis is not an isolated phenomenon but affects and is affected by the education offered in all schools, whether suburban or rural. Children who attend urban schools are, for the most part, from urban areas. However, educators frequently come into urban schools from suburban or rural backgrounds; many hope to leave urban schools for positions elsewhere. As a result, the goals and methods of urban schools are based on those developed in suburban schools. The urban children these schools fail to educate affect all schools by their negative impact upon the image of schooling in general. They are more likely to be unemployed and thus compete for, rather than contribute to, public funds. We emphasize, however, that urban economic and social conditions, not just the nature of schooling, contribute to their unemployment.

Pressure to economize, postponement of solving problems in the mistaken belief that time will solve them, the failure to foresee future

developments have forced programs of city schools below minimum acceptable standards. A great deal of money is needed, and it is needed at once, to rectify this situation. Even small changes are costly, and larger changes are more costly; but failure to change will be disastrous. The problem cannot be solved gradually by putting in small amounts of money over extended periods of time. Unless urban schools receive an infusion of funds sufficient to relieve their crises, they will fall farther and farther behind. We approve the concept of Federal, State, and local funds to be used for compensatory programs as supplemental aid. We strongly oppose any guidelines or regulations that publicly identify students for whom those funds and programs are designed. Such practice separates and stigmatizes children and can lower their self-concepts, thus becoming counter-productive to reaching desired goals.

Once accumulated deficiencies are remedied, urban schools must have means to maintain a desirable educational program. If funds are not forthcoming to provide the essential elements of the educational program, the urban schools will again fall behind and the pattern of decline will be repeated. To realize the objectives of reduced class size and individualized instruction, city schools must have money to employ enough teachers.

Funds must also be available to maintain suitable school facilities. Many urban school buildings are inadequate; some because of structural deficiencies or, if structurally sound, they are unsuited to the types of programs which urban pupils need. City schools must have the means to replace or expand outdated facilities and to add new facilities when and where they are needed.

Updating and providing adequate facilities for the inner-city student is only part of the task that must be undertaken if public education is to have real value. School staff must be expanded and trained to meet the growing problems and services demanded by urban life. Drug programs should be informational. Detection facilities should exist and treatment should be provided. Health problems such as lead poisoning, nutrition, drug use, alcoholism should be dealt with. Sex education should deal with birth control, venereal disease, abortion, prostitution, the roles of men and women in our society, etc. Family problems should be included such as unemployment and underemployment; the need for adequate income to maintain family life; child care; care and services for the aged; problems of the legal responsibilities of youth, etc.

In the inner city, as in all school populations, there are individual students with individual needs. The phrase "inner-city child" stems from the problem of defining such a singular program and any such program definition will be invalid for many inner-city students. For some, programs are inadequate; for some they are marginal; and for far too many they are inadequate. Programs should include alternatives that allow each student to follow a meaningful program. Such alternatives should include preparation

for continuing education, preparation for social work, preparation for following a trade or profession, and should fully utilize the resources of the school and the community. cultural diversity should be included among the alternatives as a sign of pride, not a sign of weakness.

Population density is also a major factor that prevents inner-city schools from developing programs which meet the diverse needs of students. Inner-city schools are too large. Size has forced school managers to design programs of pupil control rather than of educational need. The logistics of student control become the prime function of the entire staff and education is a secondary concern.

To give priority to educational needs, school populations must be smaller: elementary schools, 200-400; junior high schools, 600-1,200; and senior high schools should be no larger than 2,000 pupils. These populations are sufficiently large to support the full range of opportunities desired and yet small enough to allow personal considerations to take precedence over group control. Large inner-city schools are small cities in themselves and are mirrors of the communities where they are found. They display all the accompanying problems of too large a concentration of people. Petty crime, extortion, physical threat, and police control are all products of large populations of students forced into a physically limited environment. To make the inner-city school a beacon of what should be, rather than a mirror of what is, they must be smaller.

Identical problems are faced in large urban housing projects which are being abandoned because they are an inhumane environment. How then can the schools, an institution devoted to human development, allow such environments to continue to exist?

Racism

Racism is nurtured by economic and social segregation. Because minority groups have been exploited throughout this country's history, they have been relegated to the lower economic stratas. Nothing short of an extensive reordering of priorities and restructuring of the economy will eliminate racial and economic segregation. Schools cannot assume complete responsibility, but they do have a role to play. Integration of both faculty and students is essential in offsetting our inherited prejudices and bigotry. Democratic ideals presented in an environment of discrimination cannot be accepted as anything but a mockery. Because bigotry is an adult disease, schools offer the last chance to bridge the gap of misunderstanding and hatred between all cultural and ethnic groups. Total commitment to integration and to quality education for all is required of teachers, school officials, and the community.

The Task Force recognizes that acceptable integration plans will include a variety of devices, such as geographic realignment, pairing of schools, grade pairing, and satellite schools. Some students may be bused to implement integration plans that adhere to the letter and the spirit of the law. However, we oppose any integration plan that results in the displacement or demotion of any member of a school staff.

Bilingual/Bicultural Education

Bilingual education is not a novelty. Many types of bilingual curriculums are found throughout the world. Among the nations that accept this educational practice are Belgium, Canada, several African nations, France, and the Soviet Union.

American schools that educate children from various and different cultures have virtually ignored this aspect of education. Consequently, many Americans suffer the economic and social inequities which result from substandard education.

Language is the most important part of a culture. History shows that taking away language is the first step toward destruction of culture. People without culture find themselves in the same isolated condition as an individual who has lost his memory.

Every person is entitled to cultural respect. Bilingual students may be a minority of the student population, but public schools do exist where more than 90 percent of the school population speaks English as a second language.

Bilingual/bicultural education focuses on the linguistic and cultural needs of America's multicultural population. It is emerging as an important factor in the instructional program. No one particular bilingual model is applicable for every geographical area. The Spanish-speaking children in Laredo, Texas, who come from Mexico, have different needs from the Spanish-speaking children in Newark, New Jersey, who come from Puerto Rico and Cuba--even though they speak the same basic native language. A basic contention is that language deprivation is a central educational handicap from which other handicaps may derive. To attack this deprivation, the steps to follow are:

1. Instruct a student in his native language.

2. English as a Second Language (ESL) must be studied intensively. ESL gives special consideration to the unique cultural aspects that the student brings to the classroom. It does not propose to replace the native language in the student's own environment. It takes into account the language and cultural differences of the student's background.

3. As the students attain a higher level of English usage and understanding, English can play an increasing role in subject matter.

4. Develop students who are equally functional in two languages.

Federal funds should be used to establish bilingual/bicultural programs in all areas of public education to serve all ages and to meet all needs. If this task is initiated with State funds, it will cause a drastic reduction in current State-supported programs. This is no more desirable than the present lack of adequate bilingual/bicultural programs. Major components of an adequate program of this nature are:

1. History and culture: programs designed to impart to students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their languages.

2. Early childhood: programs designed to improve children's potential for learning.

3. Adult education: programs particularly for the parents of children participating in the bilingual program.

4. Dropouts: programs conducted for dropouts or potential dropouts having need of bilingual programs.

5. Vocational education: programs conducted by accredited trade, vocational, or technical schools.

An effective bilingual/bicultural program for students is dependent on an instructional staff properly prepared to make such a program functional. Teachers need more language training to teach English properly--let alone to teach it as a second language. Teacher training institutions should set up special courses such as: "Teaching English as a Second Language" and "Culture of Minority Groups." To support such a teacher training program, further research is needed in the following:

1. Scientific linguistic studies of speech

2. Analyses of influences of one language on another

3. Analyses of cultural differences

4. Non-language intelligence tests

5. The advantages rather than the disadvantages of bilingualism

Specific criteria for either evaluating existing bilingual/bicultural programs or for establishing such programs where they do not now exist are:

1. The program should increase competence in the English language.

2. The program should address itself to the particular and diverse needs of the community.

3. The program should consist of activities leading toward the achievement of long-range goals.

4. The program should include involvement and participation of non-English speaking adults as well as other adults.

5. The program should foster respect for minority cultures.

6. Modern practices in language education should be used.

7. Appropriate training for teachers and paraprofessional personnel should be an integral part of the program.

8. Successful parts of the program should be continued after Federal funds, used to initiate programs, are no longer available.

9. The program should be economically efficient.

10. Teachers, through their professional organizations or bargaining agents, should be involved from the initial planning stages, through implementation, to evaluation of program effectiveness.

Educational Accountability

Educational accountability seems to be focused on the teacher, although student performance is measured, and the decisions that determine teacher behavior are, for the most part, made by State legislatures, State departments of education, local lay boards, and school managers. Teachers do not quarrel with the concept of accountability. We do have serious differences with current and proposed methods of achieving accountability.

Our first concern is that limited measures of student behavior are being used to determine the effectiveness of school programs and, particularly, teachers. If student behavior were solely determined by the experiences gained from contact with school programs and teachers, there might be merit in evaluating teachers by observing pupil behavior. However, a teacher is present for only 1 hour in 7 of a student's life. This hour should be an

influential one, but it cannot necessarily have more effect on student behavior than the other 6 hours in which the student is exposed to community conditions, parental models and values, and peer influence. We accept these uncontrolled variables affecting student behavior; they cannot be changed. Teachers cannot be held totally accountable when so many other external decisionmakers and groups influence both teacher and pupil behavior.

Our second concern is that teachers are held accountable for program effectiveness; they are not responsible for program design or for the provision of adequate resources to implement the program. Funding, program, and operational decisions, which have a profound effect on what teachers do or fail to do, are made by groups other than teachers. Management accountability is missing. Accountability can only have meaning when responsibility and authority for decisionmaking are vested in the accountable group. The teachers' centers described earlier are a means whereby teacher accountability can be realized by placing responsibility and authority for decisionmaking with the group expected to perform specific tasks.

When two groups, both the employing district and teachers' organizations, are responsible for competence, things can begin to happen. Tenure may not be needed if job security is maintained through due process and defined in an agreement that specifies working conditions, including specific responsibilities. A competent staff will be maintained by having the opportunity and the obligation for continual professional training.

When responsibility with authority is established, accountability for all can take place.

Class Size

Experience and common sense indicate that the size of a class affects both the students' ability to benefit from instruction and the teachers' ability to serve learning needs. Two recent studies confirm this position. Martin N. Olson's study, Classroom Variables that Predict School System Quality (1970), concludes that "critical breakpoints" in class size drastically affect performance. In Class Size and Pupil Learning, Orlando Furno and George J. Collins found that, over a 5-year period, students in smaller classes made significantly greater gains. Small class size costs more, but it is a significant factor in educational performance.

Repeatedly, surveys of teachers' concerns have shown that teachers rank class size as one of the most serious problems confronting them. Alternative education, free schools, career education, schools without failure, bilingual programs, tutorial projects, utilization of

paraprofessionals, interest in learning centers, and resource centers, are a reflection of the concerns of the public and the profession toward personalizing educational experiences. The impact of television has increased the demand on teachers to recognize the uniqueness of the individual student and to plan for each an appropriate program.

Historically, teachers have pursued a course of humanizing education. Large classes, mandated curriculums, and excessive work loads have made this extremely difficult to achieve. The public and the organized profession are demanding that assembly line education no longer be practiced, that the school and classroom recognize the importance and value of each individual student. Demands are made to place greater emphasis on experimental and humanistic education. The challenge before America is to recognize that experiential and humanistic education requires increased individual student-teacher contact, increased resource and specialist assistance, improved training of teachers, and substantial reduction in class size. Failure to humanize and modernize public education will create increased teacher and student militancy. Excessive class sizes should not be tolerated by the organized profession any more than doctors of medicine tolerate health standards and facilities which are detrimental to their patients.

We do not attempt to state what the optimum class size should be. An adequate ratio of teachers to students is needed so that the staff can meet the educational needs of the students. It is absurd to think of a class in football with less than 22 students; it is equally absurd to think of a class larger than two or three in teaching reading to the neurologically handicapped. The capricious assignment of an arbitrary number of students to a single teacher, with no concern for the educational needs of the students, is intolerable. Teachers have a long history of designing educational programs to meet budgetary criteria. It is time that educational needs determine budget allocations.

Teacher Surplus

Classes are too large and they should be smaller. The experiences needed by students to pursue a program designed to meet individually identified needs presumes that the school has the personnel resources to meet these needs. To expect a single teacher to meet this demand for a large group of students is naive. Rather, a student's program should be viewed as an educational package with components of that package identified with appropriate staff. Staffing a school means making available a variety of skills and talents dictated by educational needs--not a fixed ratio of adults to students. The fact that currently qualified teachers are unemployed has been falsely described as a "teacher surplus." This is a lack of utilization of available resources.

Until education becomes an American priority, we will have a "teacher surplus"; when education becomes an American priority, we will again have a teacher shortage. The major contributing factor to this problem is a lack of public understanding of the teachers' role, which is too often seen as

custodial; when a school has enough custodial staff (teachers), the community is satisfied. When the role of the teacher is seen as one of facilitating learning, it will also be apparent that teacher availability to children is the prime determiner of what constitutes an adequate staff.

In short, the solution to the "teacher surplus" is adequate financing for public education.

Early Childhood Education

Learning is dependent on prior experience, which is important for young children if they are to fully utilize learning opportunities. The broad range of experiences provided by early childhood or kindergarten programs plays an important role in the intellectual and social development of young children. It establishes a base for successful learning throughout their academic careers. Denied an appropriate learning environment in early formative years, children suffer a developmental lag which is difficult to overcome. A child whose home environment is filled with activities and play experiences warrants challenging over and above what is available to him. Curves of mental growth rise rapidly in early childhood and taper off in later adolescence. Thus, the development of early childhood education centers should be priority items on both national and local educational lists.

The progress made by young children when they enter school depends upon their readiness for learning in the school environment and upon the provisions the educational system makes for variations in readiness. The basic factors that contribute to this readiness are linguistic attainments and aptitude, visual and auditory perception skills, muscular coordination and motor skills, number knowledge, and the ability to pay attention and follow directions. The amount of mastery of these skills depends upon many factors: intelligence, home background, health and physical condition, emotional maturity, social adjustment, and general background of experience. Regardless of background, children vary greatly in their mastery of these skills. The various levels of readiness which primary teachers must cope with make it impossible to attend to the learning needs of individual pupils under present pupil-teacher ratios.

The original concept of early childhood training stands in great need of reform. Such programs were seen, and are still seen, as child care programs, providing a welcome service for those who can afford it and a necessary service where economic conditions dictate that dual roles of breadwinner and parent be played. This concept is manifest in private nursery schools for those who can afford it and publicly supported day care centers for those with limited incomes. There is no doubt that such activities meet a need. However, many are limited in providing educational experiences and serve either the rich or the poor, missing most of our population. What is needed are purposefully designed educational programs which provide activities and materials enabling children

to develop understandings, attitudes, and skills that lead to a ready acceptance of sequential reading, mathematics, and language development as well as provide structured and nonstructured play, socialization, spontaneous expression, and enriching cultural experiences.

The Federal Government must assume the initiative in seeing that programs of early childhood education are available to all children from ages 3 to 6. Participation in such programs should not be mandatory, but it should be made available on an opportunity basis. Further, such programs should not be in lieu of home experience but rather an adjunct to home experience. This is achieved by parental participation in both the planning and implementation of any program activities.

Programs and materials should be designed to insure each child an opportunity to do things that measure potential. Such programs and materials should include built-in assessment mechanisms which provide information about weaknesses and strengths--thus enabling the teachers and the school to set goals and objectives to insure the utilization of each child's potential through individualized program planning and instruction.

Standardized Tests

The indiscriminate use of standardized tests to classify or regiment groups of human beings is counter-productive to encouraging the maximum development of each student. When the interpretations of such tests are based on norms, it is guaranteed that 50 percent of the students tested will fall below the median; a significant portion of that below-median group will be classified as failures, regardless of any absolute measures of accomplishment. Longitudinal data are not available to justify relating pupil scores to the ability to function as a responsible citizen in society. Yet these devices continue to be used as planning mechanisms in deciding future educational experiences for students. The design of the standardized tests presumes standardized goals for all students. This is a denial that students are individuals with individual educational needs. Until effective methods of student needs evaluation are developed, standardized tests have no role in the improvement of education.

These opinions are based upon the current indiscriminate use of available standardized tests. This should not be considered a denunciation of testing to diagnose educational needs or to assist teachers and students in evaluating achievement related to agreed-upon educational objectives.

The "4-Day" Teaching Week

Most teachers spend hours outside the classroom preparing lesson plans and materials, keeping abreast of the latest developments in their fields, evaluating student work, and supervising extracurricular activities. Much is done at home, not at school where the proper resources should be available. Teacher "homework" must be sandwiched into a domestic scene and is subject

to the interruptions of normal home and social life. One reason given for failure of inservice programs is insufficient stamina on the part of teachers. To achieve professional vitality and maintain high professional standards, major changes such as the 4-day teaching week are needed. Classes can be taught for 4 days, the 5th day used for: development of curriculum materials and instructional media; individual and group research; supervision of student teachers, interns, and paraprofessionals; individual and team planning; preparation time; participation in teacher-directed inservice growth programs; visits to children's homes; and self-renewal (travel, reading, independent study, school visitations, community involvement, or attendance at meetings).

Student "5 day" alternatives might include: work on special projects; e.g., with specialists in arts and crafts or computer-assisted instruction; individual study and research; work with supervised student teachers, interns, and paraprofessionals who conduct academic drills and teaching programs; remedial skills and enrichment activities; play periods; youth-tutoring-youth projects. Students might confer with counselors, social workers, and community workers; visit teachers' homes; or devote the day to self renewal (travel or reading, independent study, school visitations, community involvement, or attendance at meetings under supervision).

Thus, teachers and students can be more free to create and to act upon their personal decisions--decisions related to their mutual efforts to achieve an optimum education.

Performance-Based Teacher Education (PBTE)

It is necessary to differentiate between performance-based criteria and performance-based certification. The former is responsive to an educational need; the latter is an attempt to solve a political problem.

Performance- or competency-based criteria attempt to focus teacher training on the skills needed in the classroom. The development of a coherent body of knowledge about teaching in terms of its effect on the learning process is a positive step. The absence of a formulated "technology of teaching" which translates into concrete instructional skills and methodologies permits most new teachers to flounder until they can hold their own. This has contributed to a general lack of confidence in the profession. With no clear "expertise" proclaimed by the profession itself, the public feels that anybody can teach. Efforts viewed as positive steps change teacher preparation programs to more classroom related experiences which will generate specific skills and instructional knowledge.

It must be stressed, however, that research in the teaching process is very primitive. No comprehensive and systematic scheme for observing and measuring teacher behavior exists. No competencies have been validated, although thousands have been listed.

Research and development experts make a good case for development at the pre-service stage and following up with research to validate. Admitting that no teaching strategy has been scientifically proven effective, a model can be made of what experienced teachers think is valid. Teacher groups should co-operate to develop the performance model while simultaneous research is undertaken.

Questions must be raised about criteria levels. Shall criteria be based on "product" (pupil achievement) or on "process" (teaching behavior and methodologies)? The former ignores the many factors influencing achievement and could lead to "teaching to the test" and dehumanization. Shall teaching behavior be judged under actual classroom conditions within a restricted micro-teaching context or by using peer pupils? Is understanding a skill sufficient or is the criterion the demonstration of the skill? What level of mastery is sufficient?

Performance-based certification suggests that prospective teachers shall not be licensed until they demonstrate minimum standards of competency, but no research exists to validate the criteria to be used. The literature talks about inservice or continuing certification, but many questions must be posed in this area: Shall experienced teachers be called upon to demonstrate their retention of skills (or grasp of new skills) on a renewable basis? Shall certification be permanent or continual? Are there, indeed, basic techniques necessary for all prospective teachers? Is general performance to be the yardstick of performance in each of a number of skill areas? Should salaries be linked to demonstrated skills?

A number of recommendations are in order:

1. Teacher groups must be included in developing teacher education programs. Teachers should control their own inservice training.

2. Intensive research must be undertaken immediately to scientifically and objectively determine the criteria necessary to positively affect learning.

3. Classroom teachers must be involved in all levels and aspects of research and development in performance-based education programs.

4. We oppose the "product" notion of teacher performance and support the "process" emphasis.

We recommend that until there is adequate and substantial research in the teaching and learning arena to provide a data base for responsible decision-making:

1. There be no attempt to institute performance-based certification.

2. There be no attempt to relate salary to skill acquisition or performance-based criteria.

3. That the teacher be included in all work in teacher training institutions, State departments of education, etc., to keep abreast of developments and to analyze any position introduced in performance-based education programs.

The Total Community as a Learning Center

The isolation of school programs from other educational experiences is a common weakness of most public schools. Acceptance of the total community as a learning center is long overdue. In developing programs to meet educational needs, teachers need to be aware of, and have the opportunity to utilize, the wide learning experiences available in the community. For example, if a student has interest in government that extends beyond what is covered in his government class, he should have the opportunity to work directly with a person involved in government (such as a local council member or an employee of a government agency). Further examples include: work study programs, community-supported cultural activities, and organized physical recreational programs.

The effective use of the community's learning resources implies additional responsibilities for school districts. There must be a commitment by the district to this type of program expansion. This commitment might be an awareness of the opportunities present to support funding if the alternative is freely open to the public. There must be a change in the way the school records pupil achievement. In addition to cumulative records and transcripts, the school needs to monitor educational experiences over which it does not have direct control but which are of significant value to the student. Such an expansion of school responsibility not only provides wider learning opportunities for students but provides teachers a more realistic understanding of each student's experiences and enables them to do a better job of teaching.

Performance Contracting

Performance contracting removes the determination of educational policy from the hands of the public and places it into the hands of private industry. It threatens to dehumanize the learning process and promotes "teaching to the test." It sows distrust among teachers through a structured incentive program which frequently includes merit pay. It subverts the collective bargaining process and reduces teacher input. It is predicated on the assumption that educational achievement can be improved in the vacuum of a machine-oriented classroom, without changing the environment or meeting the needs of the poverty-stricken, academically deprived child.

In spite of the apprehension of teachers, during the school year of 1970-71, the Office of Economic Opportunity conducted a $6 million experiment in 18 school districts. The experiment involved six private learning companies working with 27,000 students. Battelle Columbus Laboratories, contracted by OEO to evaluate the experiment, came to this conclusion: "There is very little evidence that performance incentive contracting, as implemented by the technology companies at the 18 school districts in this study for a period of 1 year, had a beneficial effect on the reading and mathematics achievement of students participating in the experiment, as measured by a standardized achievement test."

Additionally, an experiment was undertaken in two school districts (Stockton, California, and Mesa, Arizona) where the local teachers organization was the contracting agency. Again incentives where available to either students or teachers, depending on the desire of the agency. Again Battelle came to the conclusion, "Overall, there is little or no evidence at Stockton and Mesa that the 'Incentives Only' programs were beneficial to the students in reading or mathematics achievement, as measured by a standardized test."

Vouchers

Educational vouchers, particularly when used as a device to move public funds into private educational activities, would increase existing disparities between the available resources for rich and poor children. Their use promises to retard integration efforts, lessens the separation of church and State, and makes public schools "places of last resort." To administer such "voucher" programs requires new bureaucracies, educational voucher authorities which would be subject to tremendous political pressure such as the conservative trend toward favoring the middle-class child. Since profit-making schools may be included in voucher plans, the emphasis for this involvement could well be monetary gain, with educational achievement or innovation a secondary consideration.

Where vouchers are used experimentally to offer alternative styles of education to students and parents, there may prove to be some justification for the practice. If this should provide a better education and more satisfactory working conditions, it is worthy of further investigation. All too often school districts accept any innovative program--not on the merit of the plan but because participation in the program means additional funds. With financial support so critically low, the decision to accept such programs represents fiscalpanic, not sound educational planning.

Governance of the Teaching Profession

Teachers are professional educators. They undergo a minimum of 4 years formal preparation, including the completion of a collegiate degree, development of teaching skills, and some form of experience in a teaching environment. Any beginning teacher must serve in a nonpermanent status for a time to demonstrate teaching competency. Other professionals--doctors, lawyers,

architects, etc.--undergo a similar period of preparation and competence demonstration, yet unlike other professionals, teachers do not determine licensure requirements, standards of performance, or entry and exit provisions for the teaching profession.

Those who perform tasks unique to a profession know best what is required to perform those tasks. The teaching profession is not allowed to have a deciding voice in its own destiny. This must change. Teachers are first-class members of society. They are trained, fully capable, responsible adults. They must take over their professional reins to lead education in a more positive direction--to help students, teachers themselves, and this Nation.

Collective Bargaining

It is crucial for all teachers to have the right to bargain collectively. Protection under a contract guarantees an atmosphere of security and academic freedom. Only in this environment can teachers demand input in educational programs and use the collective bargaining process to contractually insure reform in education.

To obtain their legitimate rights as workers, teachers struggle for collective bargaining rights, master contracts, etc.

School boards often resort to court action against teachers. Arrests, convictions, fines, and jailings result. These actions encourage teacher strikes. Boards of education, confident of their power to obtain injunctions against teachers, know there is no need to bargain in good faith on legitimate issues. When one party acts irresponsibly, with total immunity from the law, chaos and gross injustices result. What is the answer? State legislatures must enact enlightened, equitable laws to facilitate collective bargaining between teachers and boards of education. Good faith bargaining on both sides must be enforced by the courts. Where necessary, an impartial third party must have power to resolve disputes fairly for all parties. Teachers will then be afforded the same legal protection now enjoyed by other workers in this country. Jailing is not an answer. Justice is.

VII. CONCLUSION

Throughout this report, the prevailing theme has been the need for direct involvement of teachers in decisions that affect the teaching and learning process. This adamant position of the Teacher Task Force underlies the belief that teaching is the business of teachers.

Providing adequate educational services for students in a dynamic learning environment is the personal concern of every teacher. This concern becomes frustration when teachers find themselves perpetuating the easily-recognized inadequacies in meeting individual needs. A major concern of this frustration is the gross mismatch between assigned responsibility for teaching and misplaced authority for educational decisionmaking. It can and must be corrected.

It is now time to look to teachers for solutions to some of our educational problems and to see that these solutions are brought from the inside out.

# # # # # #

Appendix A

Selected Items from Current Research

Before listing any selected items, a word is in order about the state of the art in educational research:

1. There is a need for accurate data concerning the teaching-learning process.

2. Intuitively, we feel that learning involves such human mental activities as appreciating and understanding, as well as the ability to demonstrate specific skills.

3. We recognize that student learning patterns and instructor teaching styles are widely variant, depending upon the background and personality of the person involved.

4. Due to the individual human differences of teachers and learners, it is unlikely that a singular theory of instruction will be made available for research testing.

5. Lack of concensus theories of instruction have caused research studies to focus on items peripheral to the teaching-learning relationship.

6. The primary data source for much of the current research has been pupil performance in specific cognitive skills and demographic data concerning pupil populations. It seems that the availability of data-gathering instruments dictates the nature of research instead of the information need determining the nature of the data-collecting device.

7. The very nature of data-collecting and interpreting mechanisms reinforces the validity of current school operations. They do not provide the means to question the appropriateness of educational programs. For example, IQ or educational achievement measures based on chronological age and/or current grade assignments in school are accepted as valid means of determining pupil expectation.

8. The handling of large populations in a research study tends to cause the data to be reported as norms, with conclusions based on this normative data regardless of the diverse educational needs present.

In spite of these concerns, we acknowledge that the research undertaken to date provides some bases for making decisions about educational programs. More important, such studies tell us with cold, cutting clarity how little we know, and how much we have yet to learn about the teaching-learning process and how schools can make that process more effective.

The following research studies are cited for two reasons. One, they show that studies can be made in the area of teaching and learning, and two, they support our thesis that the availability, preparation, and experience of teachers are major contributors to an effective educational program. The Task Force did not report the interpretations of the findings, though the temptation to do so, in favor of teachers, was strong.

Benson, Charles S. and others. State and Local Fiscal Relationships in Public Education in California. Report of the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Revenue and Taxation. Sacramento: Senate of the State of California, March 1955.

Sample: Fifth grade students, 249 school districts, California

Data Source: Reading Achievement Test

Findings: Teachers' salaries and instructional expenditure per pupil are positively related to pupil achievement. "The association between the achievement of pupils and the instruction offered by these teachers who are qualified by experience and training to be paid in the upper salary quartile is positive, and the association stands independently of the known connection between the home environment of pupils and their achievement."

Mollenkapf, William G. and S. Donald Melville. "A Study of Secondary School Characteristics as Related to Test Scores." Research Bulletin 56-6. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1956. (Mimeographed.)

Sample: 17,000 9th grade and 12th grade students, male and female

Data Source: Aptitude and Achievement Tests

Findings: The following factors affect pupil achievement:

(1) number of special staff, psychologists, counselors, etc.
(2) class size
(3) pupil-teacher ratio
(4) expenditure per student

The findings suggest the central importance of the school staff and of students having relatively frequent contact with that staff.

Goodman, Samuel M. The Assessment of School Quality. Albany: State Education Department of New York, 1959.

Sample: 70,000 7th grade and 11th grade students, male and female

Data Source: Achievement Test

Findings: The following factors affect pupil achievement:

(1) per pupil instructional expenditure

(2) number of special staff per 1,000 students

(3) teacher experience

(4) the degree to which teacher was "student-oriented" in contrast to being "subject matter-oriented."

The findings point to the importance of the school's personnel in the instructional process.

Thomas, J. Alan, "Efficiency in Education: A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Inputs and Mean Test Scores in a Sample of Senior High Schools." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Stanford University, School of Education, 1962.

Sample: 10th grade and 12th grade students, data taken from project TALENT

Data Source: Achievement Test

Findings: The following factors affect student achievement:

(1) beginning teachers' salaries
(2) teachers' experience
(3) number of volumes in school library

Green, Robert Lee and others. "The Educational Status of Children in a District Without Public Schools." East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Education, Bureau of Educational Research Services; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education Cooperative Research Project, No. 2321, 1964.

Sample: Age groups, 6 years through 17 years. Students attending volunteer schools within Prince Edward County and children not attending such schools. (Public schools closed by authority of the Board of Education.)

Data Source: Stanford Achievement Test

Findings: Students attending school perform better on standardized tests than those not attending.

Coleman, James S. and others. Equality of Education Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Sample: 660,000 throughout United States

Data Source: Verbal Ability Test

Findings: Achievement test results tend to improve in relation to the verbal ability level of the teacher.

Burkhead, Jesse, Thomas G. Fox, and John W. Holland. Input and Output in Large City High Schools. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967.

Sample: 90,000 high school students in Chicago, 19,000 high school students in Atlanta, and 180 small community high schools.

Data Source: Aptitude and Achievement Tests and dropout rates

Findings: The following factors affect pupil performance:

(1) newer buildings associated with lower dropout rates

(2) teachers' experience linked to pupil reading scores

(3) low teacher turnover positively related to pupil verbal ability

Central Advisory Council on Education. Children and Their Primary School, II. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

Sample: English Elementary School Students

Data Source: Several separate studies

Findings: Age of building, teachers' experience, academic preparation, and "ability" are positively associated with student output measures.

Furno, Orlando F. and George J. Collins. Class Size and Pupil Learning. Baltimore: Baltimore City Public Schools, October 1967.

Sample: 16,449 3rd grade pupils (all the 3rd grade pupils in Baltimore City Schools).

Data Source: Baltimore public school system records

Findings: Pupils in smaller classes in both the regular and special education curricula were found to make significantly greater achievement gains than students in larger classes.

Kiesling, Herbert J. "Measuring a Local Government Service, A Study of School Districts in New York State," Review of Economics and Statistics, 49; August 1967.

Sample: 70,000 7th and 11th grade students in New York

Data Source: Test of Basic Skills and Educational Development

Findings: The relationship of expenditure to performance in large urban districts is quite strong. However, just what service made the difference in performance was not determined. One extrapolation that can be made is that teachers' salaries account for 65-85% of the school's budget.

Shaycroft, Marion F. The High School Years: Growth in Cognitive Skills. Pittsburg: American Institute for Research and University of Pittsburg School of Education, 1967.

Sample: 6,500 students, a longitudinal study of the same students progressing through high school, with data student-based, not school-based. Individual students were tested regardless of their mobility from district to district.

Data Source: Battery of 42 aptitude and achievement tests.

Findings: The availability of a particular curriculum in a school is related significantly to whether or not students grew in knowledge about the subject matter contained in that curriculum.

Cohn, Elchanan. "Economies of Scale in Iowa High School Operations," Journal of Human Resources, 3; fall 1968.

Sample: Iowa high school students, 377 districts.

Data Source: Achievement Test

Findings: The higher the salary and the fewer different teaching assignments for a teacher, the higher the test scores of pupils. High schools with enrollments between approximately 1,250 and 1,650 students are most cost-effective.

Olson, Martin N. "Classroom Variables that Predict School System Quality," Research Bulletin, 11; New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Institute of Administrative Research, 1970.

Sample: 18,528 classroom observations

Data Source: Structured observational guide

Findings: "Any way one tries to slice it, smaller classes produce significantly higher scores (Indicator of Quality, pupil performance data not taken) than large ones."

Research Report. The Office of Economic Opportunity Experiment in Educational Performance Contracting to Office of Economic Opportunity. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Columbus Laboratories, March 1972.

Sample: 35,000 students, grades 1, 2, 3, and 7, 8, and 9 from "low income" families according to ESEA Title I or OEO criteria in 18 school districts.

Data Source: Achievement Tests

Findings: There is very little evidence that performance incentive contracting had a beneficial effect on the reading and mathematics achievement of students participating in the experiment.

APPENDIX B

Teacher Centers: Who's In Charge?

David Selden, President
American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO

David Darland
Instruction and Professional Development
National Education Association

Despite recent attempts to rearrange the structure of American education through the use of modular programing, paraprofessionals, computer-assisted instruction, differentiated staffing, and other devices, the teacher remains central to the education enterprise. Yet throughout the last decade, teachers have been treated as though they were interchangeable labor units, following the plans of curriculum directors and administrators. Now, however, there is a growing realization that whatever else is needed for effective education (1) schools cannot succeed without effective teachers, and (2) teachers cannot be effective unless they have confidence that what they are doing is "right." The best way for teachers to acquire this confidence is to make sure that they are involved in the design of the educational process as well as its execution. Good curriculums, creative instructional materials, efficient organization and management, modern facilities and equipment--all of these contribute to the effectiveness of education. But all depend for their full realization upon the skill, the wisdom, and the commitment of teachers.

American educators, probably more than any other national education group, have long been preoccupied with method. Despite constant efforts to simplify and routinize the work of teachers through use of syllabuses, programed materials, and "by-the-numbers" techniques, effective teaching remains a complex, demanding endeavor requiring intellectual capacity, intensive training, and constant re-examination and continuing development. We are concerned here with this latter phase of teacher development commonly called inservice.

Changing American Education

Inservice training has a bad reputation among teachers. For nearly half a century American teachers have been required to attend courses throughout their working careers, very often because of the bureaucratic imperative that everyone be treated alike rather than because of a desire by teachers to improve their skills. Too many of these classes have been spiritless time-fillers. Instead of being an instrument for educational change and teacher renewal, inservice training as we have known it has tended to increase teacher resistance to new methods and concepts. Teacher bargaining agents now regularly include elimination of "Mickey Mouse" inservice courses as a standard working condition improvement demand.

Teacher resistance to intelligence-insulting inservice courses is reinforced by the general feeling among teachers that they are scapegoats for the failure of society to function satisfactorily for many Americans. Most teachers try hard to do a good job. Given a fair-sized class of middle-class kids and a little help from administrators and supportive personnel, they will succeed. Thrust into large classes in schools surrounded by the violence, crime, filth, and poverty of big-city ghettoes, all but the most gifted teachers fail more often than not. Teachers in such nightmarish positions bitterly resent being told that they must "change." "We need help," they say, "not just new methods. Give us smaller classes, more teacher aides, administrators with backbone, and good materials, and we will do the job."

Few educational reformers accept the teacher view that more money must be invested in education before schools can be made more relevant, human, and positive. During the 50's and 60's, confrontation with the school establishment became the style. Instead of promoting reform, however, the chief result was a defensive reaction on the part of teachers. The reformers have charged that too many schools have been confronting children instead of helping them, yet these proponents of educational change were themselves guilty of the same tactical mistake.

American education has now (January 1972) reached a crisis of near-catastrophic proportions. The crisis is not only the racial integration impasse, nor is it only the collapse of our system of school finance; our schools simply are not adequate to meet the demands of our time. The urgency of providing effective education for all Americans, particularly those blacks, browns, and other racio-ethnic groups who have been largely excluded from our system, is extreme. But marshalling funds and reconciling racial conflict are political problems; staff development and retraining is a technical--or professional--problem, the solution of which can proceed independently.

Teacher-Oriented Teacher Centers in Britain

The term "teacher center" was first used beginning in 1965 in Great Britain to describe a sort of teachers' club, the purpose of which was to make it easier for teachers to get together in discussion groups, to see new materials, to watch demonstrations, to attend seminars on educational matters, or just socialize. There are now 400 of these centers. Their increase has been due in large part to the encouragement of both the National Union of Teachers and the National Schools Council.

In Britain the teacher centers are governed by teacher committees, but the chief of staff, the "warden", is hired and paid by the local educational authorities. A person who attended a meeting of wardens found that they were schizophrenic about their roles and responsibilities. Many of them are finding it difficult to fulfill the teacher service function of the center and at the same time be responsive to the local education

authorities. Even so, the British teacher center is a unique development designed to improve education by serving teachers rather than instructing or directing them.

In part, the teacher-oriented nature of the British teacher center stems from the decentralized and teacher-oriented nature of the British educational establishment. The economic and status gaps between administrators and teachers in Britain are smaller than anywhere else in the world. Thus it is expected that teachers take responsibility for their own improvement and renovation. Contrary to the fears of American educational critics that "the bureaucracy cannot reform itself," British teachers have been outstandingly innovative in the period since World War II, and the teacher center is viewed as contributing to the acceptance of new ideas and methods, rather than serving as a citadel of teacher conservatism.

The British experience provides much useful information, but other alternatives should be examined.

A Centralized, Bureaucratic Teacher Development Alternative

In contrast to the British system, the problem of teacher improvement and renovation in Japan is handled through a highly centralized and bureaucratic apparatus. Japan has three grades of teaching certificates based largely on academic preparation. Although the difference in economic status between holders of each of the certificates is not great, there is a tremendous drive by the holders of the lower two certificates to become "fully qualified." The Japanese have not yet adopted the skeptical attitude of most American teachers toward higher education in general and inservice education in particular.

There are teacher education centers at the prefecture level, and there is also a national institution. They resemble American teacher training institutions in big cities, including many of the advantages of such institutions as well as the disadvantages.

The theory behind the Japanese system is that the teachers are offered additional training on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Hence, there is very little teacher interchange, and the question of teacher control of the inservice or extra service training institutions seems not to have occurred to teachers.

The system of graded certificates and inservice opportunities seems to offer a way to compel teachers to continue their education over a long span of years. Attempts to transfer this concept to the United States would almost certainly arouse great teacher resistance, but it works in Japan, probably because of the generally hierarchial and conforming nature of Japanese society. Japan is largely a monolithic society wherein hierarchy is not assumed to be autocratic. American teachers have, in the

last decade or so, succeeded in offsetting some of the authoritarianism in American education by the development of collective bargaining and more effective lobbying techniques at the State level. They would not easily hand such an instrument of coersion to school officials.

Attempts to establish differentiated certificates in the States have been strongly resisted by teacher organizations precisely because teachers would be forced to enter long series of courses. Furthermore, to the extent "graduation" from one certificate to another would depend upon a satisfactory service evaluation by administrators, the multi-level system would be a form of "merit rating."

The point of this discussion is that attempts to impose additional education on teachers by State and Federal Government would almost certainly arouse violent opposition from teacher organizations--and thus the whole scheme would be likely to fail, just as similar forced inservice training has failed in the past.

A Dencentralized, Bureaucratic Model

It would be possible, of course, to conduct continuing teacher development through an agency of a local education authority. An administrator would be appointed, and paid by, a school board, presumably subsidized by USOE. The director would be responsible for developing plans for a continuing teacher education project, and after approval by the superintendent of schools and perhaps the school board, he would be given the authority to implement the plans.

The decentralized, bureaucratic model has some advantages. Once the structure of the project is established and personnel placed on the payroll, there would be a tendency (not necessarily overwhelming) for the local board of education to continue financial support even if the Federal Government were to withdraw from the field. Furthermore, the program of the training agency could be tailored to local needs. The curse of authoritarianism could be somewhat counteracted by a teacher advisory committee. Finally, local school districts do have a wide range of resources, and these could be utilized more easily by an agency which was a part of the system than they could be utilized by an autonomous agency.

But the force inherent in an official board of education agency would erect a barrier which even the most benign director would have difficulty overcoming. An official board of education agency would take the responsibility for technical improvement out of the hands of teachers. Once again, teachers would be responding to administrators rather than engaging in the problem-solving process through their own initiative and energy.

An Autonomous Model

It would be possible to establish an autonomous, self-governing teacher center through the common device of the nonprofit corporation. A charter

or constitution could be drawn up in cooperation with teacher representatives, and the center would be officially incorporated under the laws of the State. A board of directors would then be chosen, and the board of directors would in turn choose an executive director and other staff members as needed.

The term "teacher representatives" above refers to representatives selected by teachers. Where there is a bargaining agent, this means that the representatives should be chosen by the bargaining agent. Where there is no bargaining agent, the representatives should be chosen jointly by the significant teacher organizations in the center's service area. If more than one school district is to be served, the bargaining agent for each district should select an appropriate number of members of the board.

Under the nonprofit corporation form of governance, it would not be wrong to have all the members of the board of directors chosen in the way described above. If this were the case, there should be an advisory council to guide the teacher-controlled board of directors. The advisory council would include university, community, and administration representatives.

It would be possible to include university, community, and administrative representatives on the board of directors itself, of course, but in that case teachers should be in the voting majority.

Parity

The above discussion brings us to consideration of the concept of "parity". Educational reform, for better or worse, has a variegated but quite clearly defined constituency. On the accepted reformist dogma that the system cannot reform itself, the governing board of the teacher center or renewal center was originally planned to include representatives of teacher training institutions as well as representatives of the school establishment, and to emphasize the point, the board was called a "parity board." Later, when "community leaders" demanded a piece of the action, they were also inserted into the plan and, still later, some of the proposals called for student representatives as well.

At present, there are 14 agencies called teacher centers which are financed directly by the Office of Education. They function as R&D centers for classroom ideas and as retailing outlets for educational ideas and techniques. Their clientele is revolving and transitory and without formal participation in governing the projects, for the most part, but the "parity" concept is kept in one form or another.

From what we have said in previous sections of this paper, it should be clear that we do not believe "parity" in a governing or operating equality sense can have practical meaning in teacher center governance. Yet the stimulation which can come from the college intellectual community,

minority groups, and the young is a valuable ingredient in educational reform which should not be neglected. Hence the need for a strong advisory board.

Non-Teaching Staff

If we abandon the parity principle in teacher center governance, how exclusive should the center be in its clientele? Should the teacher center be concerned only with the craft of teaching or should it be concerned with over-all staff development? If other staff functions are to be served by the center, should not representatives of such groups be included on the governing board? And should not the name be changed to "staff center?"

First, we can be very positive about the need to exclude principals and other administrators from the scope of the "teacher center." Certainly administrators need re-training; their re-education may be crucial to the educational renewal effort. But unless administrators are carefully segregated in the functioning and governance of the center, their presence will inevitably defeat the purposes of the agency. They are too assertive, too used to exercising authority, and they have too much spare time to carry out their purposes to be assimilated easily. The best idea is to exclude administrators, leaving their retraining to other agencies.

How about other nonteaching educational personnel? In school systems--or fractions of school systems designated as renewal sites--which are into differentiated staffing, the center should serve all nonsupervisory personnel who are directly involved in the instructional/learning process. In such a case, however, not every rank or functional group need have representation on the governing board. Representation of "paraprofessionals" in addition to teachers should suffice. The same could be said for more traditional set-ups using only teachers and teacher aides in the classroom.

So far as guidance counsellors, social workers, psychologists, curriculum coordinators, community coordinators, nurses, and others are concerned, it would be better to set up school-by-school arrangements for their participation in policymaking and technique development, rather than set up such groups as special interests in the governmental structure.

Financial Arrangements

The Federal Government still regards itself as a sort of good Samaritan and emergency helper of the educational enterprise rather than a permanent partner. In accordance with this almost dillettante approach, the USOE has been talking about a 2-year phase-out of Federal assistance in educational renewal and teacher centers. Yet all evidence supports just the contrary concept.

We said earlier that American Education is rapidly approaching a crisis of catastrophic proportions. This crisis cannot be solved by local and State action. Inevitably, the Federal Government with its broad taxing power and national interest policy concerns must undertake a massive support program--and there is no prospect that that program can ever be diminished, let alone discontinued. That being the case it is unrealistic to talk in terms of a 2-year phase-out of such a vital activity as the teacher centers.

It doesn't seem to us that it would be possible to operate much of a teacher center for under $250,000 a year. It would be quite easy to spend many times this amount, considering what has been happening to local school budgets. It would be impossible to generate such funds from local sources alone. Therefore, it is essential that there be an open-ended commitment from the Federal Government as well as State and local sources.

Control of the expenditure of funds should be in the hands of the board of directors of the nonprofit corporation. Its annual budget, however, would require approval by the contributing governments. There is nothing unusual in such an arrangement. Almost all big city budgets must run this sort of gauntlet.

Summary

A summary of the views expressed in this paper is as follows:

1. Schools cannot succeed without effective teachers, and teachers cannot be effective unless they have confidence that what they are doing is right.

2. Traditional methods of inservice training have not been successful in improving teacher performance; teachers must take responsibility for their own professional development.

3. The main instrument of educational renewal, so far as methods and techniques are concerned, should be the teachers' center.

4. Teachers' centers should be autonomous and teacher controlled--a nonprofit corporation is the most promising model.

5. Teachers' centers should concentrate on the development of improved teaching as distinguished from other aspects of school operations.

6. Parents, community leaders, universities, and students should be represented on advisory councils not on "parity boards."

7. Teachers' centers should be viewed as permanent organizations with on-going financial commitments from all levels of government.

* U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1974 546-477/2043